

REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-10 without prejudice and added new claims 11 and 12 to more clearly define the invention. It is respectfully submitted that in writing new claims 11 and 12 Applicant has eliminated any reference to substrateless metal frames as required by the Examiner.

Original claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 4). It is respectfully submitted that Applicant's new claims 11 and 12 are clearly and patentably distinguished over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. To be more specific, new claims 11 and 12 call for two solid preformed generally C-shaped folded metal frames. The support for the solid preformed generally C-shaped folded metal frames is clearly shown in Figure 6, 7, 8 as contrasted with Figure 4 which shows the Admitted Prior Art. It is clear as set forth in the specification that an important feature of Applicant's invention is the elimination of the holes previously required by the prior art and shown in Figure 4. As set forth in the specification [paragraph 007] an object of the invention is achieved by using preformed folded frames without using holes. The focusing cup is directly glued to at least two folded metallic frames. Parts of the top surface of the folded metal frame contact the electrodes to the semiconductor device placed inside the cup. The bottoms of the metallic frames serve as the bottom contacts for surface mounting to a motherboard. The preformed metallic frames eliminated the folding stress in the prior art and therefore can be made thinner than the prior art. The elimination of the through reduces the width of the package. It is respectfully submitted that this concept is not disclosed by the prior art.

Further, Applicant's claims 11 and 12 are further distinguished over the prior art by calling for wherein said coating glue adheres said focusing cup to said top surface of said frames as a unitary structure without covering an area for contacting said electrodes. It is Applicant's contention that this feature is not disclosed by the prior art. Accordingly, it is Applicant's contention that new claims 11 and 12 are patentably distinguished over the cited art.

Applicant's position is further supported by the MPEP Section 2131.

As stated therein:

TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST
TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM.


A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference...The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. (Cites omitted)

Accordingly, it is Applicant's contention that new claims 11 and 12 should be allowed.

Since all the claims are now in proper form and clearly and patentably distinguished over the cited art, prompt favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2004


By: _____

Amir H. Behnia
Registration No.: 50,215

Dennison, Schultz, Dougherty & MacDonald
1727 King Street
Suite 105
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Tel: 703-837-9600 - Ext. 16
Fax: 703-837-0980